APP1479

9/10

Appl. No. 10/662,893 Amdt. Dated December 15, 2006 Reply to Office Action of June 16, 2006

RECEIVED **CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

DEC 15 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-17 of the present application have been rejected by the Examiner. All of the Claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious and therefore unpatentable over various combinations of by United States Patent No. 6,757,723 to O'Toole ("O'Toole") in view of US Patent No. 6,813,570 to Yao ("Yao"), further in view of Cho (US 2003/0016682) and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,925,297 to Wenzel ("Wenzel"). Applicants have amended Claim 1 in order to more distinctly claim the subject matter that is deemed to be the present invention. Specifically, applicants have added the limitation in Claim 1 from Claim 2 which further depicts the use of a software agent to identify the software needed by the entity to provide service. Now each of the independent claims contain this limitation. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider their rejection of these independent

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusion that the software agent element of amended claim 1 and claims 8 and 15 is disclosed, taught or suggested by Cho. In particular the Examiner cites to paragraph 0042 of Cho. Paragraph 0042 of Cho discloses the use of a "Middleware Agent." The Middleware Agent of Cho is not a software agent that is used by the present invention to identify the software needed by the entity. The Middleware Agent of Cho use tables to translate between the format of the middleware used in a transmitting device to the format of the middleware of the destination device (see lines 7 through 11 of paragraph 0042 of Cho). There isn't any teaching in Cho that discloses the sending a software inspector agent to an entity to discover the software needs of the entity as now claimed in amended Claim 1. There also isn't any teaching of using a software agent in a server to identify the software needs in the entity attempting the connection and then loading the software in the entity as claimed in Claim 15.

With respect to the claims 15 through 17 that were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of O'Toole and Wenzel and in view of Cho. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider applicants' arguments with respect to Wenzel. Although Wenzel teaches the use of AAA protocols for authentication of physical devices in IP networks it does not overcome the deficiencies of O'Toole as admitted by the Examiner. There isn't any motivation in O'Toole to introduce authentication because it is not necessary. In O'Toole the owner of appliances has registered by placing information in the configuration database of the registry. There is no need to authenticate an appliance that is merely looking for information

10/10

APP1479

Appl. No. 10/662,893 Amdt. Dated December 15, 2006

Reply to Office Action of June 16, 2006

from its owner. In the present invention, authentication is necessary because a user of an entity may or may not have authorization to access a particular network service for which it is requesting software. The Examiner asserts that there is a need for authentication in O'Toole and once that need is realized Wenzel teaches the use of the authentication. Applicants again assert that in the closed system of O'Toole there were not be any need for authentication. Applicants' invention is addressed to a plug-and-play wireless system where the server would not have any knowledge of what entities would be trying to connect. O'Toole presupposes the entities that would connect and all that would be needed would be the configuration information not the permission to connect.

Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of claims 1-17, in view of the above amendments and discussion, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

A three-month extension of time is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Telcordia Technologies, Inc.

(732) 699-4800